

REMARKS

The present Response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objections and/or rejections raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 10-16 are currently pending.

Claims 1-9 have been cancelled.

Remarks to Claim Rejections

The Response to Final Office Action filed September 10, 2010 by Applicants remains valid and is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety. The following provides additional remarks, and may re-emphasize some of the previously filed remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The September 23, 2010 Advisory Action contends that Applicants' September 10, 2010 filed response is not persuasive, alleging that "the question of obviousness hinges on whether a practitioner would recognize them (techniques taught by first and second references) as being suitable substitutes for each other".

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Based upon the allegation that the first reference ("Yau") teaches using a lens to focus laser beam to decompose TMA into ions, Applicants would like to point out that the second reference ("Jersch") does not establish itself as a suitable substitute for what is taught by Yau. In particular, Jersch does not teach, suggest, or imply using FOLANT technique to decompose a vapour such TMA into ions. Because Jersch does not teach

decomposing a vapour into ions, Jersch is not a suitable substitute for Yau in achieving what Yau does (decomposing TMA into ions).

The Advisory Action contends that in some places light intensity taught by Yau will not be great enough to decompose the TMA vapor. However, Applicants would like to point out that Yau does describe that a lens is used to focus the laser beam at the probe tip to a desired intensity so that the TMA decomposes into ions. This is in direct contrary to claim 10 which recites that “wherein an intensity of the light beam is NOT enough to decompose the vapour”. Here, “wherein” refers to “at the probe tip” and is clear from the context of claim 10.

Conclusion

In view of the preceding remarks, together with all of the remarks Applicants made in the September 10, 2010 filed response, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this paper. However, if there is any such fee due, please charge any such fee to the deposit account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully submitted,

/Yuanmin Cai/

Yuanmin Cai, Ph.D.
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 56,513

Dated: September 28, 2010

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINE CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Law Department, East Fishkill
2070 Route 52, Bldg-321, Zip-482
Hopewell Junction, NY 12533
Tel: (845) 894-8469
Fax: (845) 892-6363